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I. ABSTRACT

This article deals with the "new" terrorism, responses to it by the Bush administration, the impact of those policies on domestic and global security, and concludes with some brief recommendations for alternative approaches to national and global security.

The concept of "timing" plays an important role here as one objective of the article, as the 2006 midterm and 2008 presidential elections approach, is to stimulate reflection and debate among Americans with regard to post-9/11 security and, in the process, reinforce a "tipping point" trajectory away from public support for President Bush's policies toward more constructive alternatives.

* Dennis J.D. Sandole is Professor of Conflict Resolution and International Relations at the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution (ICAR), George Mason University. A founder-member of ICAR, he received his Ph.D. from the University of Strathclyde in Glasgow, Scotland (1979) and worked with conflict resolution pioneer Professor John W. Burton at University College, University of London before both moved on to ICAR during the early 1980s. His most recent publication is CAPTURING THE COMPLEXITY OF CONFLICT: DEALING WITH VIOLENT ETHNIC CONFLICTS OF THE POST-COLD WAR ERA (1999) and his new book, PEACE AND SECURITY IN THE POSTMODERN WORLD: THE OSCE AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION, will be published in early 2007.
II. INTRODUCTION: THE HISTORICAL AND GLOBAL SETTING

Significant change has occurred in global affairs over the past fifteen years. The Cold War between the democratic West and communist East, with its specter of thermonuclear annihilation, came to an end (at least in public consciousness and fears);\(^1\) the Soviet Union collapsed into fifteen successor republics, three of which (Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia) have entered both the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the European Union (EU); the Warsaw Pact receded into history; communist regimes in Eastern and Central Europe have been transformed into democratizing states, most of which (the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and the Slovak Republic) have achieved NATO and EU membership. Indeed, somewhat presciently, the current U.S. president’s father George H.W. Bush had earlier declared that, with the end of the Cold War, we had entered into a “New World Order.”\(^2\)

So it seemed until the most recent Balkan wars began with the implosion of former Yugoslavia in late June 1991, consuming most of the 1990s and tens of thousands of human lives, with the return of genocide to Europe for the first time since the end of World War II. But the return of genocide to Europe—catastrophic and shocking though it was—could not compare to what occurred in the “Switzerland of Africa”—Rwanda—during the last three weeks of April 1994, when 500,000 Tutsis and moderate Hutus were slaughtered at the low technology level of the panga knife.\(^3\) In Bosnia, Rwanda was followed a year later by Srebrenica, whose killing fields are still, 11 years later, yielding the bodies of the nearly 10,000 Muslim boys and men slaughtered there by Serb forces in July 1995.\(^4\)

---


III. ADVENT OF THE "NEW" TERRORISM

Developments in the Balkans between 1992 and 2001, with their "clash-of-civilizations" overtones, helped set the stage for what was still to come. While the world was preoccupied with violent conflict in Bosnia and elsewhere, elements of the "new" terrorism were being manifested in the Middle East and, most importantly, in the United States and Europe as well. The World Trade Center in New York City was first bombed in 1993; U.S. military personnel were killed at Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia in 1996; a mujahedeen supported by the U.S. during the Soviet invasion and occupation of Afghanistan, Osama bin Laden—a wealthy Saudi and founder of Al Qaeda—issued the first of his fatwa against the U.S. and Americans in general in 1996, in part because the West had allowed Serbs to slaughter Bosnian Muslims with impunity for three years; the U.S. embassies in Nairobi (Kenya) and Dar es Salaam (Tanzania) were blown up in 1998; and in 2000, the USS Cole was attacked in Aden (Yemen).

And then, on September 11, 2001, one month following a peace agreement negotiated by the EU and NATO between ethnic Albanians and the Government of Macedonia in former Yugoslavia (the "Orhrid Agreement"), nineteen young Arab men—fifteen of whom were Saudis and all of whom were Wahhabist (Salafi) Muslims—hijacked with boxcutters four American passenger-filled airliners in the U.S., turning them into cruise missiles with devastating effect against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. In the process, they killed themselves and some 3000 people, plus ushered in the "new" terrorism and forever changed the world into something closely resembling a Hobbesian "state of nature."

The question arises: what is new about the "new" terrorism? Although terrorism is as old as humankind itself, the attacks of 9/11 and others cited above are "new" for the following reasons:

1) They tend to be “catastrophic,”⁹ “causing the deaths of hundreds or thousands of innocent victims.”¹⁰ For example, five years after 9/11 (and one year after the London Transport bombings), Paul Stephenson, London Metropolitan Police Deputy Commissioner, characterized a foiled attempt to blow up ten U.S.-bound airlines during the height of the summer season as, “an extraordinarily serious plot and . . . attempt to commit mass murder on an unimaginable scale;”¹¹

2) They are launched from within the territory and/or against the civilian populations and symbols of former or current imperialist (“Crusader”) countries;²

3) “They tend to be carried out by young Muslims, usually males, prepared to give up their lives in the execution of their acts of violence.”¹³

Clearly, there is a need to study the “new” terrorism because it must be stopped, but “How?” remains the enduring question.¹⁴ The historically dominant paradigm in International Relations, Realpolitik (or Machtpolitik) would suggest that we stop the new terrorism by pursuing, capturing and/or killing its perpetrators: this is what the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) have been doing in Gaza, the West Bank and Lebanon.¹⁵ A major alternative paradigm, Idealpolitik, suggests that in order to stop the new terrorism, we must also know what makes it “tick”: this very few state actors attempt to do.¹⁶

Observing U.S. President Bush during his first term, there seems to have been a tendency for him to reflect the first option, with the Europeans reflecting the second. In his second term, President Bush and the Europeans may have been moving toward a “paradigmatic convergence” of sorts, facilitated by Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice. However, as recently evident at the G-8
meeting in St. Petersburg (Russia), Bush still seems to be from "Mars" while the Europeans appear to be from "Venus."  

IV. PRESIDENT BUSH'S RESPONSE TO THE "NEW" TERRORISM: THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR (GWOT)

A dominant feature of Bush administration policies in pursuing the GWOT has been the "rhetoric-reality disconnect" where, for example, Bush's policies have made Americans and the world in general less, rather than more safe, despite official declarations to the contrary.

To illustrate, although conducting military operations against the Taliban and al Qaeda in Afghanistan made sense to many Americans and members of the international community immediately following 9/11, going to war against Saddam Hussein on the basis of dubious premises, and in the process, allowing Afghanistan to slip back into the hands of the Taliban and al Qaeda, did not.

This is not simply a case of "left-wing," antiwar people clashing with "right-wing," pro-Bush people. For instance, Paul O'Neill, Secretary of the Treasury during President Bush's first term, has indicated that from Bush's first days in office—nine months before September 11—the President wanted to attack Iraq. Similarly, when those attacks occurred, Bush instructed his counterterrorism chief Richard Clarke to look for an "Iraq connection," while Clarke repeatedly insisted that 9/11 was the work of al Qaeda, and not Saddam Hussein.

No matter what the "facts" were, including the various intelligence failures; that no weapons of mass destruction were ever found; and the apparent fact that Bush wanted to go to war against Saddam "no matter what," Bush was able to convince a majority of Americans to stick with him and his mission in Iraq. This, despite the fact that the U.S.-led invasion and occupation have resulted in a major insurgency against the Americans, brutal acts of

19. Tyler Hicks, A Drive to Root Out the Resurgent Taliban, N.Y. TIMES, July 8, 2006, at 6.
terrorism against civilian Iraqi and foreign personnel and, as of this writing, the deaths of more than 2500 U.S. military personnel and countless thousands of Iraqis. Indeed, in the week after "a new cabinet was formed [in Iraq in late April/early May 2005] . . . more than 290 people—mostly Iraqis—[were] slaughtered in car bombings and other bloody attacks." More recently, "the U.N. Assistance Mission for Iraq said that 14,338 Iraqi civilians died violent deaths during the first six months of 2006. [For June 2006] alone, 3,149 civilians died that way—an average of more than a 100 a day." During July 2006, in Baghdad alone, 1850 bodies wound up in the morgue, with as many as ninety percent estimated to have died violent deaths.

The "rhetoric-reality disconnect" is revealed not only by the U.S. going to war on the basis of dubious premises and "cherry-picked" intelligence to justify the war, but that the subsequent occupation has not been facilitating the successful democracy-building that has been claimed to be occurring by the Bush administration. Indeed, as will be demonstrated later, the war and occupation have had the effect of exacerbating, rather than lessening the factors making for the "new" terrorism.

V. SUPPORT OUR TROOPS

Another example of the "rhetoric-reality disconnect" is that, on the one hand, the Bush administration lauds and demands public support for the brave U.S. military men and women fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan, reinforced regularly by the President making patriotic speeches at U.S. military installations on American holidays. On the other hand, the administration underfunds the equipment (e.g., armor) that keeps American troops alive on the battlefield:

A recent military study of a random sample of scores of Marine deaths from torso wounds between the start of the Iraq war in March

2003 and mid-2005 found that more protection on the chest, back, sides and shoulder areas could have prevented up to 80 percent of the fatalities (emphasis added).30
Almost from the beginning, some soldiers asked for additional protection to stop bullets from slicing through their sides. In the fall of 2003, when troops began hanging their crotch protectors under their arms, the Army's Rapid Equipping Force shipped several hundred plates to protect their sides and shoulders. Individual soldiers and units continued to buy their own sets (emphasis added).

The Marine Corps said it had opted to take [an] older version of [protective] ceramic to speed delivery. As of early [December 2005], officials said marines in Iraq had received 2,200 of the more than 28,000 sets of plates that are being bought at a cost of about $260 each.

The findings and other research by military psychologists suggest that an analysis of all combat deaths in Iraq, including those of Army troops, would show that 300 or more lives might have been saved (emphasis added). . . . Military officials and contractors said the Pentagon's procurement troubles had stemmed in part from miscalculations that underestimated the strength of the insurgency, and from years of cost-cutting that left some armoring companies on the brink of collapse as they waited for new orders (emphasis added).31

As a New York Times editorial put it:

The Pentagon buys some truly wondrous space-age weaponry with its half-trillion-dollar annual budgets. If the cold war ever resumes, the American military will certainly be prepared. Meantime, surely enough spare change can be found in that vast budget to accelerate deliveries of lifesaving armor to the marines and soldiers coming under fire today, and everyday, in Iraq.32

There is also a perception that the U.S. Government is underfunding treatment for post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) suffered by America's combat veterans and in the process, reducing Veterans Administration (VA)

medical benefits supposedly available to them after they have been wounded in combat and discharged from active military service:

The spiraling cost of post-traumatic stress disorder among war veterans has triggered a politically charged debate and ignited fears that the government is trying to limit expensive benefits for emotionally scarred troops returning from Iraq and Afghanistan. . . . Larry Scott, who runs the clearinghouse www.vawatchdog.org said conservative groups are trying to cut VA disability programs by unfairly comparing them to welfare.\textsuperscript{33}

Further, the more than half a million U.S. National Guardsmen/women and Reservists who have been called up in record numbers since 2001, to serve in combat in Afghanistan and Iraq or to assume other duties associated with Homeland Security, are being discriminated against in their access to GI Bill educational benefits in comparison with their active-duty counterparts.\textsuperscript{34} More significantly:

[President] Bush has passed legislation that denies the National Guard and Reservists the same medical insurance that the regular military gets and increases the costs of veterans' health care . . . Bush also signed the bankruptcy law . . . that does not exempt Guard members and Reservists who have been forced to seek relief while serving extended tours in Iraq and have been unable to cover their expenses and mortgage payments.\textsuperscript{35}

VI. SUPPORT OUR ALLIES

British Prime Minister Tony Blair, who effectively validated George W. Bush’s claim of a “coalition” in support of the war in Iraq by providing thousands of troops for the invasion, with many still in Basra and elsewhere in southern Iraq as occupation forces, has yet to receive reciprocity from Mr. Bush. In July 2005, PM Blair hosted the annual Group of Eight Industrialized Nations (G-8) meeting in Gleneagles, Scotland, still trying to convince Mr. Bush of the need to do something about Africa and global warming. Mr. Bush had earlier critiqued Mr. Blair’s Africa initiative as good for Britain but bad for the United States, and doubted that human activities cause global warming,


\textsuperscript{35} Nick Reina, \textit{Bush Hypocritical on Veterans}, PRESS OF ATLANTIC CITY, June 8, 2006, at A6.
despite a plethora of scientific evidence to the contrary (including a then recent report by the National Academy of Sciences). In this regard:

It’s no secret that the Bush administration has been almost psychotically hostile to the “fact-based community,” including, and perhaps especially, the scientific community. The debate, as it were, about whether human action has contributed to global warming is only the most prominent example of this administration’s war on science, because in point of fact there’s no “debate” about global warming at all, at least not among climate scientists (emphasis added).

After the Gleneagles and subsequent Montreal meetings, the U.S. still remains the only one of the G-8 countries that has not signed on to the Kyoto Protocol on Global Warming, despite mounting evidence of the human role in global warming and the likely deleterious impact of it on the sustainability of life on the planet. That the July 7, 2005 London bombings occurred during the Gleneagles G-8 meeting without President Bush tilting toward support for PM Blair’s Africa and environmental initiatives underscores the intensity of this particular example of the “rhetoric-reality gap.”

One year later, in July 2006, during the G-8 meeting in St. Petersburg (Russia), Bush and Blair were initially still poles apart, on how best to respond to the escalating Middle East crisis as Israel continued to bomb Lebanon in response to rocket attacks by Hezbollah. A few days later, however, Blair joined Bush in not calling “on Israel to halt its onslaught on Lebanon before Hezbollah released two kidnapped Israeli soldiers and ended its rocket attacks [thereby making the] British position . . . at odds with that of other European countries, including France, Germany and Italy, which have called for an immediate cease-fire.” (emphasis added)


38. Bill McKibben, Too Hot to Handle: Recent Efforts to Censor Jim Hansen, NASA’s Top Climate Scientist, Are Only the Latest. As His Message Grows More Urgent, We Ignore Him at Our Peril, BOSTON GLOBE, Feb 5, 2006, at E1.


VII. THE FOG OF WAR

Why the American public has not been overwhelmingly critical of these and other inconsistencies and even called for, among other things, Mr. Bush’s impeachment, may be one of the great mysteries of our time, especially after the (continuing) woefully inadequate U.S. governmental response to Hurricane Katrina, especially after revelations that the Bush administration knew more about the likely failure of the levees in New Orleans earlier than the President and others had claimed; and nonimplementation of recommendations made by the 9/11 Commission which, according to its (Republican) Chairman Thomas Kean, could have saved lives during Katrina’s assault on New Orleans and other parts of the U.S. Gulf Coast and could still save lives in the event of another terrorist attack in the U.S. In general, the former 9/11 Commission issued a “report card for” the federal government “that included 5 F’s, 12 D’s and two incompletes in categories including airline passenger screening and improving first responders’ communication system.”

“Former Chairman Kean decried these ‘scandalous’ failures and the lack of urgency in addressing [them].” He continued: “We believe that the terrorists will strike again. If they do, and these reforms that might have prevented such an attack have not been implemented, what will our excuses be?”

Another concern of homeland security where the U.S. Government has done nothing of significance is transport of lethal chemicals. According to a recent airing of PBS’s Now, which dealt with “Toxic Transport”:

Thousands of tons of hazardous chemicals are transported throughout the United States each day by trucks, trains and barges, often through heavily populated areas. Despite the danger they pose, national security experts say these transports are largely unguarded and very vulnerable to a terrorist attack. And the terrorists know it. American intelligence agencies have been aware for several years that Al-Qaeda is interested in targeting U.S. railroads. In 2002 the F.B.I found photographs of U.S. railroad engines, cars and crossings in Al Qaeda’s possession (emphasis added). “I’m sorry to say [that] since


9/11 we have essentially done nothing in this area," Richard Falkenrath, formerly one of President Bush's top advisors on homeland security, said in Senate testimony last year. Falkenrath is one of several in Washington alleging the federal government is failing to protect the nation from the threat of an attack on toxic chemicals. He says that if terrorists were to attack our chemical sector, the casualties could be on the scale or in excess of lives lost and affected on 9/11 . . . One of the military’s top scientists, Jay Boris of the U.S. Naval Research Laboratory [said that] "When the wind is in the right direction, a hundred thousand people could easily die" (emphasis added).45

In addition, there have been revelations by former Secretary of State Colin Powell’s Chief of Staff, retired U.S. Army Colonel Lawrence Wilkerson, that a Cheney-Rumsfeld “cabal” deceptively took the U.S. to war in Iraq;46 and an indictment and guilty verdict of Vice President Cheney’s Chief of Staff Lewis Libby for playing a role in that venture by “outing” a covert CIA operative, Ms. Valerie Plame, to the media in order to “punish” her husband, former U.S. Ambassador Joseph Wilson, for revealing contradictions in the Bush administration’s case for going to war in Iraq.47

Each of these potential “smoking guns” is a part of the “fog of war” phenomenon, a term first used by one of history’s great strategic thinkers, General Carl von Clausewitz, to refer to the chaos, confusion, and non-rational responses to threats that often accompany the experience of warfare.48 Progressive recognition of the “fog” in this case49 further enhances prospects for reaching a “tipping point” in public support for Mr. Bush, with even Republicans (including California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger) calling for action on global warming and the war in Iraq.50 This dynamic includes, according to polls following the Dubai Ports World debacle, record decreases in support for the Iraq war and the President’s policies in general (even among

This process has undoubtedly been reinforced by the looming enhanced civil war in Iraq between minority Sunni and majority Shiite Muslims following the destruction, on February 22, 2006, of the Golden Mosque, a major Shiite shrine in the largely Sunni city of Samarra. Full-scale civil war in Iraq, a catastrophic possibility which goes against the grain of official Bush policy and claims of “progress” in Iraq, has even been advocated by some U.S. military officers as likely to ensure that Iraq has “a true and sustainable future.”

Encouraging a “tipping point” in public support for President Bush’s policies is a goal that has less to do with ideology than a deep sense of continuing national and global danger should Mr. Bush continue with his policies for the next two years—an issue which transcends claims that Mr. Bush is “merely” incompetent. As Lieutenant General William Odom, former President Ronald Reagan’s National Security Agency director, has said: the Iraq war is “the greatest strategic disaster in United States history.”

For Colonel Lawrence Wilkerson, former Secretary of State Colin Powell’s chief of staff, this state of affairs could “get even more dangerous than it already is.”

This concept of “danger” calls forth an article I wrote on the eve of the Iraq war, appropriately entitled “The Fog of War,” in which I concluded that, for various reasons, including those cited in this article, “President Bush may have become one of the world’s most dangerous men” (emphasis added).

Among the dangers implicit in a continuation of Mr. Bush’s policies is the Iraq war’s further radicalization of Arabs and Muslims worldwide, including in Europe and Asia. This could have the effect of motivating European, Asian, and other Muslims to join the growing Jihad against the “Crusader” in Iraq, Afghanistan, Israel, Chechnya and elsewhere. Many of those “foreign fighters” could then return home as trained, experienced members of local terrorist cells available to launch attacks such as those carried out in Bali (October 12, 2002), Madrid (March 11, 2004), London (July 7 and 21, 2005) and in the process, further the self-fulfilling dynamic of the “clash of civilizations.”
VIII. FUELING THE "CLASH OF CIVILIZATIONS"

Harvard Professor Samuel Huntington caused quite a stir in academic, policy, and popular circles more than a decade ago with the publication of his controversial thesis that wars of the future would be fought between "civilizations" instead of states and that, therefore, a new "civilizational paradigm" was required to supplant the traditional state-centric one (without necessarily jettisoning Realpolitik/Machtpolitik).\(^5\)

Huntington’s thesis is that, in former Yugoslavia, the former Soviet Union and elsewhere in the postmodern world, intervention on behalf of ethnic kin can and has played a major role in conflict escalation through what Huntington—borrowing from H.D.S. Greenway—calls the kin-country syndrome, or "civilizational rallying"\(^8\):

In the post-Cold War world, multiple communal conflicts have superseded the single superpower conflict. When these communal conflicts involve groups from different civilizations, they tend to expand and to escalate. As the conflict becomes more intense, each side attempts to rally support from countries and groups belonging to its civilization. Support in one form or another, official or unofficial, overt or covert, material, human, diplomatic, financial, symbolic, or military, is always forthcoming from one or more kin countries or groups. The longer a fault line conflict continues the more kin countries are likely to become involved in supporting, constraining, and mediating roles. As a result of this "kin-country syndrome," fault line conflicts have a much higher potential for escalation than do intracivilizational conflicts and usually require intercivilizational cooperation to contain and end them. In contrast to the Cold War, conflict does not flow down from above, it bubbles up from below (emphasis added).\(^9\)

Since 9/11, Huntington’s thesis has appeared more credible to many people on both sides of the Judaic/Christian-Islamic civilizational divide, with, regrettably, a self-fulfilling dynamic helping to bring reality more in line with it: for some, including Huntington himself,\(^60\) the ultimate trap. In other words, while the "clash of civilizations" may not have been a causal factor in the

\(^{57}\) See Huntington, supra note 5.

\(^{58}\) Id.

\(^{59}\) Id at 272.

\(^{60}\) Baxter, supra note 18.
etiology of 9/11 and the subsequent Global War on Terror, it has certainly become a result.

IX. THE EXPANDING JIHAD

One troubling result of the U.S.-led war and occupation of Iraq is that, according to the authoritative *The Military Balance 2003-2004* issued by the International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) in London, the war "in Iraq has swollen the ranks of al Qaeda and galvanized the Islamic militant group's will." Such observations even predate the revelations of U.S. prisoner abuse at Abu Ghraib and other prisons in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, plus the Bush policy of "extraordinary rendition": sending suspected terrorists to other countries where torture is more a routine part of the interrogation "subculture."

According to David B. Low, national intelligence officer for transnational threats of the National Intelligence Council (NIC), the "CIA director's thinktank":

> Iraq has replaced Afghanistan as the training ground for the next generation of "professionalized" terrorists ... Iraq provides terrorists with "a training ground, a recruitment ground, the opportunity for enhancing technical skills ... There is even, under the best scenario, over time, the likelihood that some of the Jihadists who are not killed there will, in a sense, go home, wherever home is, and will therefore disperse to various other countries."

Jihadists reside in Western Europe as well as the Middle East and elsewhere. According to a PBS *Frontline* program on "Al Qaeda's New Front":

> Home to an estimated 18 million Muslims, Western Europe has become the new and deadly battleground in the war on terror. That's

---


because disenfranchised Muslims, inspired by local radical imams and jihadist websites are taking up the causes of jihad. And al Qaeda, once just a loose organization on the continent, has morphed into a powerful ideological movement. . . "The threat is before us, not behind us," France's top antiterror judge, Jean-Louis Bruguiere, tells FRONTLINE. "And we are quite concerned . . . I think that the terrorist threat today is more globalized, more scattered, and more powerful . . . than it was before September 11." What's driving the terrorism threat? Many experts in counterterrorism say it's the belief that violence is justified in order to free the Muslim world from corrupt governments and the influence of the United States and Europe. And because it is difficult for jihadists to launch an attack on U.S. cities and institutions, their focus has turned to local targets in Western Europe.68

Hence, the attacks on four trains in Madrid on March 11, 2004, killing nearly 200 and injuring more than 1400 early morning commuters; plus, a little more than a year later, on July 7, 2005, the attacks on London Transport, also during morning rush hour, killing more than fifty (including the four attackers) and wounding some 700 passengers; and a year later, on August 10, 2006, the foiled plans of the "Heathrow-24" to destroy up to ten passenger-filled airliners en route from London to major American cities:69

The key reality faced on the other side of the Atlantic is the 18 million Muslims whose ranks are expected to swell to 20 percent of Europe's population in the next 15 years. This community of immigrants who share religious and ethnic bonds has largely failed to integrate into European societies. Many are poor and subject to bigotry; they have lived in Europe for years and many were born there, yet often feel that they are not full members of society. This sense of alienation is deepened by the ubiquity of television with its non-stop images of their suffering brethren in Palestine, Iraq, and Chechnya. Inspired by local radical imams and jihadist Web sites, disenfranchised European Muslims are taking up the cause of jihad. With full-scale war between the U.S. military and Islamic insurgents in Iraq—which is just a two-and-a-half day drive from Berlin—the reality of a war between Islam and the West is a domestic problem for Europe (emphasis added).70

69. Id.
70. Id.
Accordingly, Arabs' and Muslims' perceived sense of violated needs for identity, recognition, and security, exacerbated by "historical memory" and calls to action by religious leaders and TV images of the oppression of their fellow "Wretched of the Earth" in Afghanistan, Iraq, Palestine, Lebanon, and elsewhere have likely played a role in the etiology of global terrorism and the accompanying "clash of civilizations." Further, the violent conflict-generating potential of these factors has probably been reinforced by lingering experiences of structural and cultural violence: the experience by members of certain ethnic, religious, racial, and other minority groups that they have been—and continue to be—denied access to the political, social, economic, and other resources typically enjoyed and presided over by mainstream groups in society.

The National Intelligence Council's (NIC) "new report on global trends [Mapping the Global Future, which] took a year to produce and includes the analysis of 1,000 U.S. and foreign experts" is an evaluation of Iraq's new role as a breeding ground for Islamic terrorists. . . . President Bush has frequently described the Iraq war as an integral part of U.S. efforts to combat terrorism. But the . . . report suggests that conflict has also helped terrorists by creating a haven for them in the chaos of war. . . . "At the moment," NIC Chairman Robert L. Hutchings said, Iraq "is a magnet for international terrorist activity."

. . . . Iraq has joined the list of conflicts—including the Israeli-Palestinian stalemate, and independence movements in Chechnya, Kashmir, Mindanao in the Philippines, and southern Thailand—that have deepened among Muslims and helped spread radical Islamic ideology. . . . At the same time, the report says that by 2020, al Qaeda "will be superseded" by other Islamic extremist groups that will merge with local separatist movements. Most terrorism experts say this is already well underway. The NIC says this kind of ever-morphing decentralized movement is much more difficult to uncover and defeat.


NIC officials said their greatest concern remains the possibility that terrorists may acquire biological weapons and, although less likely, a nuclear device (emphasis added).\footnote{74}

Approximately one month after the release of the NIC report, top U.S. national security officials, including former CIA director Porter Goss, told Congress that the Insurgency in Iraq continues to baffle the U.S. military and intelligence communities, and the U.S. occupation has become a potent recruiting tool for al Qaeda and other terrorist groups (emphasis added):\footnote{75}

"Islamic extremists are exploiting the Iraqi conflict to recruit new anti-U.S. jihadists," CIA Director Porter J. Goss told the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence [on 16 February]. . . . "These jihadists who survive will leave Iraq experienced and focused on acts of urban terrorism," he said. "They represent a potential pool of contacts to build transnational cells, groups and networks in Saudi Arabia, Jordan and other countries." . . . [such] statements underscored the unintended consequences of the war in Iraq.

"Our policies in the Middle East fuel Islamic resentment," Vice Adm. Lowell E. Jacoby, director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, told the Senate panel. "Overwhelming majorities in Morocco, Jordan and Saudi Arabia believe the U.S. has a negative policy toward the Arab world."

"It may be only a matter of time before al Qaeda or another group attempts to use chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear weapons," Goss said (emphasis added).\footnote{76}

Concerning the possibility of further attacks in the U.S., FBI Director Robert S. Mueller III said "transportation systems and nuclear power plants remain key al Qaeda targets,"\footnote{77} while James Loy, acting deputy secretary of homeland security, said: "any attack of any kind could occur at any time."\footnote{78}

In his recently published book, Dying to Win: The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism, Robert Pape argues convincingly, based upon perhaps the

\footnote{74. Id.}
\footnote{76. Id.}
\footnote{77. Id.}
\footnote{78. Id.}
most comprehensive empirical dataset on the subject, that suicide terrorism is a response to foreign occupation of the terrorists’ homeland. If that is indeed the case, then the long-term presence of U.S. and other military forces in Afghanistan, Iraq and elsewhere in the Arab and Muslim worlds does not augur well for a less dangerous, more stable world where Americans, Israelis, Russians and others are safe.

Given that Osama bin Laden has apparently received approval from a Saudi cleric to use a nuclear device against the United States, Pape’s demonstrated empirical connection between U.S. occupation abroad and suicide attacks against Americans may include the nuclear option as a viable “next step.” We have, therefore, with the “new” terrorism, clearly returned to “thinking about the unthinkable.”

The possible terrorist use of nuclear weapons against American targets is the ultimate danger implicit in Mr. Bush’s policies—a danger which, as of this writing, has undoubtedly been enhanced by Arab and Muslim perceptions worldwide that the Bush administration supports, and therefore is complicit in, Israel’s destruction of neighboring Lebanon.

European allies are particularly alarmed about the disproportionately high civilian death toll in Lebanon. They are also concerned that the U.S. position will increase tensions between the Islamic world and the West by fueling militants, playing into the rhetoric of Osama bin Laden and adding to the problems of the U.S.-led coalition force in Iraq (emphasis added).

X. AN ALTERNATIVE VISION OF U.S. POLICY

The “new” terrorism is not just a law-and-order “security problem” to be resolved by force, which is how it tends to be “fought”; hence, the “Global War
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on Terror" (GWOT). The "new" terrorism is a complex phenomenon that must be addressed by multiple actors performing different roles over time in a coordinated fashion if the "war on terror" is ever to come close to being "won." What this means is that, in addition to addressing the violent symptoms of relationships that have gone wrong (which is clearly important), analysts and policymakers must address those relationships and the underlying causes and conditions of why they have deteriorated.\textsuperscript{84}

Referring again to Pape's seminal study, as long as forced military occupations endure, the more likely it is that the occupied and oppressed will conduct terrorist attacks—including suicide or martyrdom missions—against the occupier and oppressor.\textsuperscript{85} The "lessons" here for the U.S., Israel, Russia, Thailand, and the Philippines, among others, should be clear. If all we do is "fight fire with fire" (symptoms), then we are likely to have a greater, more enduring fire. If, on the other hand, we address the fire's underlying causes and conditions, denying the fire further oxygen and other combustible sources, then we are more likely to "resolve" and not merely "manage" or "settle" it! As former USMC General (and USCENTCOM Commander) Anthony Zinni said with regard to the "causal linkage" between the Middle East and other conflicts: "You solve the Middle East [conflict and] you'd be surprised what kinds of other things work out."\textsuperscript{86}

\section*{XI. CONCLUSION}

We end with a sobering hypothesis: The more dangerous the world becomes, in part, because of Mr. Bush's counterproductive policies, the better it is for the President (at least in the short term) to rally the country behind him on otherwise contentious issues (e.g., torture, wire-tapping, the Patriot Act). In other words, the U.S. military presence in Iraq has been "good" for Mr. Bush, at least up until now, not because it has made the world safer—which this article has argued is patently not the case—but because it has provided the President with a continuing "psycho-emotional cover" initially provided by the 9/11 attacks, for an ideologically-framed political agenda that might otherwise meet with more resistance, debate, and revision.\textsuperscript{87}
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As I said earlier: "President Bush may have become one of the world's most dangerous men" (emphasis added). This proposition has been demonstrably reinforced by his steadfast refusal to support international calls for an "immediate ceasefire" in response to the escalating Middle East conflict and destruction of Lebanon during and after the July 2006 G-8 meeting in St. Petersburg, with the argument that, until Israel had destroyed Hezbollah’s capacity to make war against it, a ceasefire would be "premature" (emphasis added). Given the television coverage of death and destruction in Lebanon, such a position has likely had significant implications for the "new" terrorism and further attacks on the U.S. and Americans in general—the foiled plans to blow up ten passenger-filled aircraft flying from London to major American cities being but a recent example.

It is clear from all indications that the world is currently beset with multiple complex crises, where U.S. military forces are stretched to the point that they cannot even participate in galvanizing international action to stop the acknowledged genocide taking place in Darfur, western Sudan. Just imagine if, at this time of interconnected global crises, North Korea were to do something more drastic than fire off some missiles that fall harmlessly into the Pacific Ocean. Or if, in response to the calls of his irate neo-conservative critics to be "more aggressive," President Bush were to attack nuclear facilities and other sites in Iran, in effect, do to Iran what Israel has been doing to Lebanon. According to Zbigniew Brzezinski, former President Jimmy Carter’s National Security Advisor:

I think of war with Iran as the ending of America’s present role in the world . . . Iraq may have been a preview of that, but it’s still redeemable if we get out fast. In a war with Iran, we’ll get dragged down for 20 or 30 years. The world will condemn us. We will lose our position in the world (emphasis added).

Apropos the extent of President Bush's responsibility for negative relations with Iran, de Bellaigue explains that:

The U.S. president did not cause Iran's reform movement to fail. It was flawed by the timidity of its leaders and their followers. But it is no coincidence that the movement went into terminal decline immediately after Bush included Iran [along with Iraq and North Korea] in his 2002 "axis of evil." That speech, and the subsequent invasion of Iraq, convinced Iran's clerical leaders that Bush was determined to try and topple the Islamic Republic. One of the ways they reacted was by intensifying their assault on liberalizing, reformist Iranians. The hard-line establishment depicted all democracy seekers as traitors; they were discredited, tortured, or jailed. Iran's pro-democracy movement could not survive in the atmosphere of protracted crisis that Bush helped create. If there are attacks and a national emergency, things will get worse. Pro-democracy newspaper columnists, striking bus drivers, dissenting students—all will be smashed with an iron fist. Military action will herald a crisis of the kind that, during the Iran-Iraq War [1980-1988], Khomeini's followers used in order to limit democracy and eliminate their opponents. The Islamic Republic will become more fanatical, and anti-American feeling, strikingly absent in many Iranians, will grow (emphasis added).  

In the event of U.S. military action against Iran, perhaps with nuclear weapons to eliminate hard-to-access underground uranium-enrichment facilities at Natanz, as President Bush and Vice President Cheney initially insisted, the results could be catastrophic. This, not just because of how such an event would play out on the Arab and Muslim "streets" via Al Jazeera, Al Arabiya and other TV outlets, but also given Iran's influence on the price of oil worldwide and its linkage with the dominant Shiite population, leadership and militias in Iraq and with Hezbollah in Lebanon, with profound implications for American and Israeli security in the region and elsewhere. If Iran were sufficiently enraged by an American attack, it might decide, among other things, to open a second front in Hezbollah's missile war against Israel. And then nuclear-armed Israel, with a very low threshold for insecurity, could do to Iran what it has been doing to Lebanon, and more. And then . . . ?

According to Hobbes, the "state of nature" is where there is war "of every man against every man," and where "the life of man [is] solitary, poore, nasty, brutish, and short" (emphasis added).
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With the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the world has, indeed, changed. Regrettably, despite his administration's declarations to the contrary, President George W. Bush has done nothing but continue or facilitate the negative trajectory of events. It almost seems that, with events spinning out of control in the Middle East, we are on the verge of a global conflagration. Indeed, Muslims in Britain, one of the world's great centers of cultural tolerance, believe that Bush's and Blair's policies in Iraq and Afghanistan and Israel's policies in Lebanon, Gaza and the West Bank, constitute a "war against Islam."\(^9\)

Accordingly, one acute challenge now is for more Americans to think about this state of affairs and to explore more constructive, security [survival]—enhancing alternatives to the Hobbesian state—especially before Osama bin Laden gets his hands on that nuclear device—and then to take appropriate action at the polls in November 2008, as they did in 2006.

The outcome of Ned Lamont's recent antiwar challenge to Democratic (pro-war) Senator Joe Lieberman in Connecticut is one indication of what is possible in this regard:

Ned Lamont's victory . . . in Connecticut's U.S. Senate primary is great news for Democrats. And it's a watershed moment for the growing majority of Americans, in red states and blue, who want change. For months, polls have warned that across the political spectrum people are fed up—with the no-end-in-sight occupation of Iraq; with an energy policy that caters to oil giants while gasoline prices soar; with a health—care system that leaves more behind with every passing day. Lamont's victory is evidence that a long-awaited wave of voter sentiment on those issues has materialized (emphasis added).\(^9\)

In the meantime, American politicians, lawyers, journalists, analysts, consultants, political science students, and others should do some soul-searching and brainstorm policy alternatives for American voters to choose from, lest voter alienation and frustration with the political process (two possible indicators of the "tipping point") reach new heights.\(^9\)
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